

Subject: MASHIN, [redacted]
MASHIN, [redacted]

SECRET

Source: R. [redacted] / 57

Date: 14 Dec. 1965

1. Meeting took place in the lobby of the International House of Columbia University. Source was sitting in the lounge with Miss SIMKO around 13 Dec. 1965. Subject happened to walk by and saw Source, a conversation followed and Miss SIMKO invited Subject and Source to her room for a glass of wine. In the room there was no political conversation. After app. 1/2 hour Subject and Source went together to a nearby bar and continued their conversation alone.

2. Subject asked Source if it was possible for Source to obtain for him a book with modern American graphics, and some original woodcuts so that he could send them to his child's godfather DACHNO who is an artist and works in the journal "TRAVEL". Subject said that he would be very grateful for this, and hoped that an arrangement could be reached so that he would send Source some of DACHNO's original works in return, and other modern Ukrainian artists. Source was very receptive to this proposition and said that he would do all he can to obtain these materials for Subject. Subject added that it might even be possible to have some of these materials printed in the journal "TRAVEL". Source suggested that there are very very fine Ukrainian artists in the US whose works might interest DACHNO, naming [redacted] as one of the best. Subject seemed interested and asked if he could possibly obtain some of his works.

3. In Subject's room Source received the following as presents from Subject: A hard-covered booklet "KIEV", magazine USSR Oct. 1962, and the Oct, Nov, and Dec. issues of the magazine "Soviet Life" for 1965. Subject said that he had received all this from the Soviet embassy in Washington, and considered it junk, but said that he had to give Source something. Source was thankful, and said that he would have to give Subject something in return mentioning that recently there was publication

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCES METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

in New York a book of poems written by young Ukrainian poets. Subject seemed very interested and said that he would like to have it.

4. In the room Source noticed that subject had issues 1 and 2 of SUCHASIST 1965. Subject himself took the journal out and pointed to the document about fire in Kiev library commenting on it, ^{mentioned before} that it was the same document that ~~was~~ ^{had been} asked how he liked SYMONENKO'S poetry in the first issue. Subject nodded his head and said that he enjoyed it. Later in the bar, Subject commented that he considered SYMONENKO as Ukrainian patriot, and not necessarily a nationalist. Adding that it is wrong to make Symonenko into a nationalist god or symbol, since there are many like him. Subject went on by stating that young Ukrainian poets are put on the spot by the Ukrainian emigration many times. He gave an example of DYACH. If the emigration begins to refer to him as a person hostile to Ukraine he is worried and troubled, but on the other hand if he is made into a nationalist by the emigration he is put into a tight spot at home, and may be accused of nationalism in his works. Subject repeated that Symonenko and others like him must be considered Ukrainian patriots. When asked why there was such a disparity between the Soviet and emigrative editions of Symonenko's poetry, Subject laid the cause on the authors right of withholding certain poems. Source did not agree saying that the reason was for the contents of the poems themselves. But added that a comparison can soon be made, when the complete edition of Symonenko's works are printed in the US and in the Ukraine. Since both editions will be post-humous, there will be no question on authors rights. Subject, when asked if emigration should continue to publish such works as Symonenko's answered yes, but without any commentaries, attached. Subject then asked Source if there was in fact a difference in the poetry of Symonenko printed in Ukraine, and the version printed in America, how did the the poetry get to America? Source said that he did not know.

5. Subject commented on document about fire in Kiev library (in the bar) and said that it was a Soviet action. He repeated before that it was impossible for a

SECRET

Library to be burned in any country of the world. Source contended that the document was not a falsification, but told the bitter truth instead. To this Subject said, "If it really is genuine, tell me how it found its way to the USSR". Source ignored the question, saying that the emigration had no need to falsify such documents, besides the other facts given in the document speak for its authenticity.

6. Subject asked what Source thought of the new changes in the Soviet leadership. When told that it was too early to tell about any definite trends, Subject agreed and commented that it would probably take about one year to see who is the dominant figure in the Soviet government. Subject praised PIDHORNY and SERBEST adding that they were both largely responsible for the removal of Khrushchev. Source speculated that SERBEST was removed because of the large following he had in the KGB. Subject agreed, but mentioned that the role of the KGB has been cut, with younger men taking over key positions. Along with this, Subject attacked Stalin harshly, and talked about the personality cult. He then asked Source if he had read "Khrushchev's Secret Speech at the twentieth party congress". Subject brought out facts from this speech, then attacked Khrushchev himself for forming a cult around himself. When asked if this can repeat itself, Subject said that he did not know, but that everything is possible.

7. Subject showed Source a photograph of Patriarch ALEXIS in Soviet Life magazine. Source jokingly commented that he was a "1st class KGB officer". Subject laughed but did not comment. Source mentioned that Cardinal SLIVY was recently released from Siberia and is presently in Rome. Subject was familiar with the cardinal's name and said that he is very popular in Lviv. When told that the cardinal had given the impression that he might want to return to Lviv in the future, Subject said that he would be given a very warm welcome. Subject praised the Cardinal as a man with a strong will, who had undergone a very difficult life. On the topic of nationalism

and of GURGENIA. Subject praised the leaders of the nationalist movement as idealists, but downgraded the rest of the movement to banditism.

8. The new constitution might be proclaimed in 2-3 years according to Subject. There are Ukrainian jurists at work presently on this constitution, but he is not familiar with their names.

9. Subject stated in app. 2-3 weeks prof. MEDVACHO from Kiev University will come to the US to attend the meetings of the U.N. commission on human rights. He classified MEDVACHO as a very humorless person, very proper and strict.

10. Stated that Boris ATOMENKO-DAVIDOVICH is the husband of Lira KOTENKO. Had heard that DAVIDOVICH had been imprisoned, but did not know too much about him otherwise.

11. Would like to obtain some jazz records but complained that they cost too much.

12. No definite time was arranged for the next meeting, but Subject told Source to come whenever it was convenient for him.

13. During a discussion of Kholodnytsky and the Pereyaslav treaty, Subject mentioned that he had doubted the wisdom of Kholodnytsky in making the treaty. And likes to wonder what Ukraine would be like now, if it was completely independent.

14. Subject said that the next Ukrainian Minister of Foreign Affairs would be YEMENKO. Subject at first stated that YEMENKO already is the new minister, but later was sure of his prediction.

15. When questioned about the possibility of having more than one name on a ballot in Soviet Elections, Subject responded very positively, saying that he would like to see "eleven to thirteen names on a ballot". Subject complained that presently he had to vote for a person that he doesn't even know, and the only thing he can

~~SECRET~~

this question is presently being discussed in the USSR.

16. Subject asked Source what Source's opinion was about the future perspectives for the Ukrainian nationalist movement in the USSR. When told that nationalists will try to find a common language with Ukrainians in Ukraine, and will continue to press certain issues such as diplomatic relations of the USSR with the western world, and Ukrainization or de-russification of Ukraine, Subject did not comment. Source in return asked what are the perspectives of cooperation of the Kiev Committee with the emigration. Subject replied that presently many people in Ukraine know about the emigration, and this is due partly to the government, but one cannot exclude the possibility that the Central Committee (Subject did not specify which, CPU, or CPSU) can "close the door" on all contacts with the emigration in the future. Subject would not like to see this happen, but did want to comment too much on this topic.

17. After the 11 Oct. 1965 meeting Source had ^{with} Subject, Subject complained to other persons that Source was too aggressive in his political views. While at above meeting, Subject himself engaged Source in political discussions.

~~SECRET~~